IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

C. R. No. 281 of 2006
Date of decision January 19, 2007

Subhash and another

.....Petitioner

Versus

Hans Raj and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINEY MITTAL

Present:- Sh. Arun Singal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Sh. Surya Kant Gautam, Advocate
for respondent Nos. 2 and 7.

****

Viney Mittal, J (Oral)

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and taking into consideration that application for additional evidence has been rejected by the trial Judge by making various observations, it would not be appropriate to interfere in the revisional jurisdiction of this Court at this stage.

Consequently, the present revision petition is dismissed. However, the petitioners would be at liberty to challenge the aforesaid order, if an occasion arises for them to file an appeal against the final judgment and decree of the trial Court.

Dismissed with the aforesaid liberty.

(VINEY MITTAL)
JUDGE

January 19, 2007
archana